

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10/654,550 CONFIRMATION NO. 09/03/2003 Howard Hooper 100110809-3 5097 7590 03/19/2004 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY **EXAMINER** Intellectual Property Administration GLEITZ, RYAN M P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2852 DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•	W
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/654,550	HOOPER, HOWARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan Gleitz	2852	
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutor. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tition. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	1 .		
•	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 and 23-38 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16,23-26,29-34,37 and 38 is/ 7) ☐ Claim(s) 27,28,35 and 36 is/are objected 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration. are rejected.		·
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 September 20</u> Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	003 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). n(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in a re priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No.	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/654,550

Art Unit: 2852

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hodoshima et al. (USPN 5,182,601).

Hodoshima et al. disclose a converter for converting a non waste-residue collecting toner cartridge to a waste-residue collecting toner cartridge. The cartridge, toner handling device (1), serves as either a developing device or a cleaning device (Col. 6, lines 30-38). A developing device is non waste-residue toner cartridge, and a cleaning device is a waste-residue collecting toner cartridge. Figure 2 illustrates a toner storing member (Col. 2, line 24), which reads on a waste-residue collection site. Cleaning roller (12; col. 9, line 34) reads on a waste-residue remover.

Regarding claim 2, an opening, as shown in figure 2, positioned proximate a photo conductor drum (11) is disposed within the cartridge, and the remover (12) is operably associateable with the photo conductor drum (11).

Regarding claim 3, the waste-residue collection site is a waste-residue hopper.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the toner storing member (Col. 2, line 24) reads on means for collecting waste-residue from the photo conductor drum (11), and the cleaning roller (12) reads

Art Unit: 2852

on means for removing waste-residue from the photo conductor drum (11) and directing the waste-residue into the means for collecting waste-residue.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, the toner handling device serving as either a developing device or a cleaning device also reads on the method for converting a non waste-residue collecting toner cartridge to a waste-residue collecting toner cartridge.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-16, 23-25, 29-34, 37, and 38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3, 7-9, 11-13, and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,621,996. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application includes a method for converting a toner cartridge from a cleanerless toner cartridge to a conventional toner cartridge, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a cleanerless toner cartridge is equivalent to a non waste-residue collecting toner cartridge. A cleanerless toner cartridge or a toner cartridge without a cleaner has no waste residue to collect. A non-waste

Application/Control Number: 10/654,550

Art Unit: 2852

٨V

residue collecting toner cartridge operates in the same way, performs the same function, and achieves the same result as a cleanerless toner cartridge.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 14-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,577. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent includes a housing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the toner cartridge of the pending application would include a housing. All toner cartridges must include a housing.

Claims 23-26, and 29-30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,577. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent does not include the waste-residue converter at least partially within the housing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the wasteresidue converter would be within the housing. If the waste-residue converter is part of the toner cartridge, it must be at least partially within the housing of the toner cartridge.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 27, 28, 35, and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 23-26, 29-34, 37, and 38 would be allowable if the above nonstatutory double patenting rejection is overcome.

Art Unit: 2852

Claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if the above nonstatutory double patenting rejection is overcome.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 9 and 10 of the amendment, filed 03 September 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-16 under Sato et al. (USPN 5,870,654) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection of claims 1-3, 9, 10, 13, and 15 is made in view of Hodoshima et al. (USPN 5,182,601).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Gleitz whose telephone number is (571) 272-2134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 8:00AM and 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Arthur Grimley can be reached on (571) 272-2136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2852

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arthur T. Grimley Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800